REMARKS

Claims 1 and 2 are pending in the application. By this paper, claim 1 has been amended. Reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-2 in light of the amendments and arguments herein are respectfully requested.

Prior art rejections

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. patent no. 6,701,366 to Kallas, et al ("Kallas"). Claim 2 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kallas in view of U.S. patent publication number 2003/0039250.

Kallas actually relates to a communications system which provides script modules for performing various telephony services. The script modules are stored and accessible by a scripting engine. Upon receipt of a request to establish a communications session, the scripting engine invokes one of the script modules for execution to perform one or more actions. Column 4, lines 4-12; column 7, lines 12-32. The system of Kallas is highly centralized, with a single scripting engine 100, although Kallas discloses the possibility of distributing this function. Column 7, lines 59-65. One disclosed example of a scripting module is an interactive voice response (IVR) task. FIG. 8 and column 9, line 48 – column 10, line 18.

Claim 1 has been amended to better distinguish the invention defined by this claim over the cited reference. As amended, claim 1 relates to a personal Interactive Voice Response (IVR) system which includes an IVR server and a plurality of personal IVR service node clients. Claim 1 has been amended to recite "an IVR server" rather than "a plurality of IVR servers" in order to better match the embodiment of FIG. 7.

Further, claim 1 has been amended to recite that the plurality of personal IVR service node clients is "in data communication with" the IVR server. As noted in the present application at page 3, lines 19-24,

> In personal IVR service nodes the voice information is sent in digital form in discrete packets, rather than in the traditional circuit-committed protocols of the PSTN. One of the advantages offered by the present embodiments is the simplicity in which call and information routing takes place.

This advantage of the presently claimed invention is captured by the description "in data communication with the IVR server."

Claim 1 has been further amended to recite that each personal IVR service node includes "an application operable in conjunction with the personal IVR service node to allow a subscriber to create and modify custom operational features of the personal IVR service node to be used when handling received calls." Support for this amendment may be found at page 20, lines 10-21 where it is explained that "the personal IVR service node enables a subscriber to create and modify a custom personal IVR service node using either GUI or Web application... *A subscriber can easily change* the personal IVR service node as and when the subscriber wishes to do so." *(emphasis added)*

Kallas does not disclose this easy changeability of the personal IVR service node. In Kallas, the script modules are pre-existing and stored in a location which may be a centralized location where they are accessible by a service scripting engine. When an appropriate request is received, a script module is retrieved and interpreted. Kallas discloses that additional script modules may be created, column 7, lines 53-58. This must be done by the scripting engine, not by any personal IVR service node in the system.

Moreover, the system described by Kallas fails to operate in the manner contemplated by the present invention of amended claims 1-2. In the claimed system, the IVR server controls other facilities of the system in response to personal IVR service node information. For example, if a subscriber selects an option to record a voice message, the personal IVR service node records the message and converts voice-representative data to the IVR server. For subsequent call processing, the IVR server contacts, for example, a call processor, which sets up call connections based on call requests of the subscriber and a caller. Page 22, lines 23-30; page 24, lines 19-21. The system in accordance with the present invention is thus a highly-centralized

structure, centered about the IVR server. This is in contrast with decentralized structures, such as conventional call center IVR systems or the system of Kallas. Page 21, lines 26-29.

Accordingly, claim 1 recites limitations nowhere shown, described or suggested by Kallas. Claim 1 is therefore allowable over this reference. Claim 2 is dependent from claim 1 and is allowable for the same reasons. Withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1 and 2 is respectfully requested.

With this response, the application is believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the examiner deem a telephone conference to be of assistance in advancing the application to allowance, the examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

John G. Rauch
Registration No. 37,218
Attorney for Applicant

November 15, 2004
BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. BOX 10395
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60610
(312) 321-4200